

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed January 15, 2004 (the "Office Action") and the Advisory Action mailed April 8, 2004 (the "Advisory Action"). In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicants amend Claims 1, 3-4, 9, 11-12, 15, 17, 19-20 and 23. Applicants cancel Claims 2, 10 and 18 without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,483,522 to Derby et al. ("*Derby*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,432,783 to Ahmed et al. ("*Ahmed*"). The Office Action rejects Claims 7-8, 15-16 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Derby* in view of *Ahmed* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,016,306 to Le Boudec et al. ("*Le Boudec*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Amended Claims 1, 9 and 15 each includes the determination of "asymmetric connections between receiver transmitter pairs (RTPs) in a network node; the RTPs each comprising intra RTP connections between internal RTP components, the intra RTP connections having a higher speed than the asymmetric connections between the RTPs, wherein the internal RTP components comprise an optical receiver and an optical transmitter for interfacing with a wavelength division multiplex (WDM) system." Neither *Derby* nor *Ahmed* disclose, teach or suggest these elements. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 9 and 15 are patentable over the cited art used in the rejections and request that the rejections of Claims 1, 9 and 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 3-8 depend from Claim 1, Claims 11-16 depend from Claim 9 and Claims 19-24 depend from Claim 17. Applicants thus respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 3-8, 11-16 and 19-24 be withdrawn.


**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

Attached herewith is a check in an amount of \$770.00 made payable to the "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks" to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e). The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants

  
Chad C. Walters  
Reg. No. 48,022

Date: April 15, 2004

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980  
(214) 953-6511

Customer Number: **05073**